



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2002

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/374,374	08/13/1999	DANIEL M. COFFMAN	Y0999-276-(8	3661	
75	590 08/27/2002				
FRANK CHAU ESQ F CHAU & ASSOCIATES LLP SUITE 501			EXAMINER		
			ARMSTRONG, ANGELA A		
1900 HEMPSTEAD TURNPIKE EAST MEADOW, NY 11554			ART UNIT PAPER N	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		2654		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Jan-

- La				006			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	\overline{U}			
ž,	Advisory Action	09/374,374	COFFMAN ET AL.	Ì			
	naviesi, nearest	Examiner	Art Unit				
	·	Angela A. Armstrong	2654				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addre	9SS			
Theref final re conditi	EPLY FILED 05 August 2002 FAILS TO PLACE ore, further action by the applicant is required to a ejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (on for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appenation (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli 1) a timely filed amendment wh	cation. A proper replich places the application	ly to a ation in			
	PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) 🗵	<u> </u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
ь) ∟	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ad- event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date on SIX MONTHS OF THE STEED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE	of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. Se	∞ MPEP			
have bea 37 CFR (b) abov	ensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exter 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortenee, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three matent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nsion and the corresponding amount of th d statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extent the final Office action; or (2)	nsion fee under 2) as set forth in			
	A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
(a)	they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);				
(b)	☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);					
(c)	they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or si	mplifying the			
(d)	they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claim	ns.			
	NOTE:						
3.	Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):					
4.	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a	separate, timely filed	amendment			
5.🛛	.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>see attached</u> .						
6.	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7.	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
	Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
	Claim(s) rejected:						
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8.	☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9.	9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:							

Application/Control Number: 09/374,374

Art Unit: 2654

Response to Arguments

1. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "the application associated with the user command is unknown to the dialog manager, but the dialog manager determines the target application by determining the current context via a history of events") are not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Further, at col. 6, lines 11-16, Papineni et al discloses that multiple forms may be used simultaneously, each corresponding to a task in a domain of tasks, and that the invention's dialog manager does not know a priori which form corresponds to the user's utterance, which reads on "the application associated with the user command is unknown to the dialog manager."

TÄLIVALDIS IVARS ŠMITS